AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-5. These sheets, which include Fig. 1-5, replace the original sheets including Fig. 1-5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (3)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants has amended claim 13. Accordingly, claims 5-7 and 12-16 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections - Drawings

The drawings were objected to because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the "microcontroller" and the "microprocessor" must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the drawings as the controller element 5 does not show a microprocessor. To overcome the rejection, the label "CONTROLLER" has been removed from Figures 1-5. Page 7, lines 9-11 of the present application provides that the element shown as reference numeral 5 is a control circuit that can be implemented in a number of ways such as a microcontroller or a microprocessor.

3.) Examiner Objections - Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter: "the microcontroller further comprises a microprocessor." Claim 13 has been amended to provide that the *control circuitry* further comprises a microprocessor. Page 7, lines 9-11 of the present application provides that the element shown as reference numeral 5 is a control circuit that can be implemented in a number of ways such as a microcontroller or a microprocessor. A microcontroller is a computer-on-a-chip used to control electronic devices. It is a type of microprocessor emphasizing self-sufficiency and cost-effectiveness, in contrast to a general-purpose microprocessor. A typical microcontroller contains all the memory and interfaces needed for a simple application, whereas a general purpose microprocessor requires additional chips to provide these functions.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bruwer (US 6,249,089). In a prior Office Action, the Examiner conditionally allowed claim 5 and, by implication, the claims dependent thereon. The basis for the conditional allowance was that none of the references disclosed, taught nor suggested an apparatus where the controlled switch (i.e., element 4 in the drawings of the present invention) is implemented as a disable switch of a voltage regulator. However, in the most recent Office Action, the Examiner cites Bruwer (US 6,249,089), in which the Examiner states that such an element has been found at column 11, line 56. However, this line refers to a regulator (see Fig. 15. element 1505), not a disable switch of a voltage regulator. As seen in claim 5, a primary object of the present invention is the disconnection of the control circuitry from the battery to avoid leakage current that will drain the battery. This feature of disconnecting the load from the battery using a disable switch of a voltage regulator is not shown in Figures 1-7, 9-11 or 14-15 of Bruwer. Therefore, the allowance of claims 5-7 and 12-16 is respectfully requested.

5.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frako, as disclosed by applicant (DE 19533537). Frako discloses a control logic (18) as a controlling switch (16). However, neither the Abstract nor the Figures of Frako indicate that the control switch (16) is implemented as a disable switch of a voltage regulator. Therefore, the allowance of claims 5-7 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruwer in view of Hull, et al. (US 5606242). Claims 12-16 depend on independent claim 5, which recites the use of a controlled switch implemented as a disable switch of a voltage regulator. Neither Bruwer nor Hull, alone or in combination, disclose nor suggest the use of a controlled switch implemented as a disable switch of a voltage regulator. Therefore, the allowance of claims 12-16 is respectfully requested.

6.) Prior Art Not Relied Upon

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure. None of the references cited in PTO-892 alone disclose, nor together suggest, the present invention.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 5-7 and 12-16.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael Cameron, #50,298/

Date: July 17, 2006

Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com